

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

---

AMANDA MORALES,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 1:21-cv-01044-KWR-JHR

SUPREME MAINTENANCE INC., WADE HUNT,  
and GLORIA SANCHEZ,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO PIERCE THE CORPORATE VEIL**

THIS MATTER comes before the Court upon Plaintiff's Motion to Pierce the Corporate Veil (**Doc. 44**), filed August 1, 2022. Having reviewed the applicable law, the Court finds that Plaintiff's Motion (**Doc. 44**) is **NOT WELL TAKEN** and, therefore, is **DENIED**.

**DISCUSSION**

The Court finds Plaintiff's Motion is premature. Plaintiff has requested that the Court hold Supreme Maintenance Inc.'s shareholders and or Clean Team Cleaning liable because allegedly Supreme Maintenance Inc. fraudulently sold the corporation to Clean Team Cleaning. Supreme Maintenance Inc.'s shareholders and Clean Team Cleaning are not a party in this lawsuit and there is not a judgment against Supreme Maintenance Inc in this instant case.

The Court is mindful that Plaintiff in this action appears *pro se*. A *pro se* litigant's pleadings are to be construed liberally and are held to a less stringent standard than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991). The Court can overlook the "failure to cite proper legal authority," "confusion of various legal theories," "poor syntax and sentence construction," or "unfamiliarity with pleading requirements." *Id.* However, the Court cannot assume the role of advocate for a *pro se* litigant, *id.*, and the Court

cannot “supply additional facts [or] construct a legal theory for [the] plaintiff that assumes facts that have not been pleaded.” *Dunn v. White*, 880 F.2d 1188, 1197 (10th Cir. 1989).

Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2), “a party may amend its pleading only with the opposing party’s written consent or the court’s leave.” Fed. R. Civ. P 15(a)(2). Plaintiff may file a Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint to seek the Courts approval to amend her complaint and add Defendants.

Because neither Supreme Maintenance Inc.’s shareholders nor Clean Team Cleaning are parties in this lawsuit and there is no judgment against Supreme Maintenance Inc., the Plaintiff’s Motion is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



KEA W. RIGGS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE